

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,897	09/05/2003	Joel W. Schwartz	VBLT:014US	1548
32425	7590 10/30/2006		EXAM	INER
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.			WEGERT, SANDRA L	
600 CONGRESS AVE. SUITE 2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, T	X 78701		1647	
			DATE MAILED: 10/30/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. ,	·						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Assistant Commence	10/656,897	SCHWARTZ ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Sandra Wegert	1647					
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commur - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply wi Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION O	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)☐ Since this application is in condition fo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>20,23 and 24</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· ·	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12, 14-19, 21 and 22</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	·						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	Evaminer						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
oce the attached detailed office action		Toolived.					
•							
Attachment(s)	_						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P103) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		nformal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/15/03</u> . 6) Other:							

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims

The Information Disclosure Statement, filed 15 December 2003, has been entered into the

record. Applicants' election without traverse of Group I (Claims 1-19, 21 and 22), in the Paper

of 30 June 2006, is acknowledged. Claims 20, 23 and 24 are withdrawn from consideration as

being directed to non-elected inventions. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claims 1-19, 21 and 22 are under examination in the instant application.

Claim Rejections/Objections

Claim Objections

Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and

any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections- 35 USC § 112, first paragraph - scope of enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in

the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and

shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-12, 14-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because

the specification, while being enabling for a method of using 4-(4-dimethylaminostyrl)-N-

Application/Control Number: 10/656,897

Art Unit: 1647

methyl- pyridinium (ASP⁺) to measure transporter activity of the norepinephrine transporter, *NET*, does not reasonably provide enablement wherein ASP⁺ is used to measure the activity of other neurotransmitter transporters. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1-12, 14-19, 21 and 22 are drawn to methods of measuring the activity of a transporter as well as using the transporter to screen for agents that modulate the transporter. The specification discloses using ASP⁺ to test noradrenergic transporters in the same way that MPP⁺ has been used to study the kinetics of dopaminergic transporters (Brandis, K., 2006, Eukaryon, 2: 22-27), but without causing the cell death that is a consequence of using MPP+. The scope of the patent protection sought by the Applicant as defined by the claims fails to correlate reasonably with the scope of enabling disclosure set forth in the specification for the following reasons:

The specification discloses experiments in which the activity of *NET* was measured in the presence of the artificial substrates APP+ and MPP+ in several transfected cells and in one cell line that expresses *NET* endogenously (see Figure 1). Experiments were also described in which it was shown that ASP⁺ competes with norepinephrine (NE) transport. Additional studies showed that ASP⁺ accumulation is sensitive to cocaine and desipramine.

The specification as well as the inventors' own published research (Schwartz, et al, 2003, J. Biol. Chem. 278 (11): 9768-9777) cite evidence that ASP⁺ can be used to study noradrenergic (NET) transporters. However, there is no evidence that the artificial substrtae ASP⁺ can also be used to examine the kinetics of other transporters, even neurotransmitter transporters.

Art Unit: 1647

Transporters are rather specific for their substrates (Peter, et al, 1996, J. Biol. Chem., 271(6): 2979-2986) and the Specification does not demonstrate that *NET*'s interaction with ASP⁺ has the same specificity and kinetics as is typical of other neurotransmitter transporters.

In <u>In re Wands</u>, 8USPQ2d, 1400 (CAFC 1988) page 1404, the factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Due to the large quantity of experimentation required to determine how to use ASP⁺ in conjunction with transporters other than *NET* in measuring neurotransmitter transport, the lack of direction or guidance in the specification regarding same (e.g., the lack of guidance regarding transporter experiments using ASP⁺ and other transporters), the lack of working examples that read on use of other transporters, the state of the art showing that neurotransmitter transporters differ in their substrate specificities, and the breadth of the claims which embrace several unrelated transporters - undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and use the claimed invention in its full scope.

Conclusion: Claims 1-12, 14-19, 21 and 22 are not allowable for the reasons cited above.

Claim 13 is objected to.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Application/Control Number: 10/656,897 Page 5

Art Unit: 1647

examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached at (571) 272-0961.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLW 19 October 2006

> EILEEN B. O'HARA PRIMARY EXAMINER